

STEPHEN M. TILLERY (*pro hac vice*)  
stillery@koreintillery.com

GARRETT R. BROSHUIS (*pro hac vice*)  
gbroshuis@koreintillery.com

AARON ZIGLER (*pro hac vice*)  
azigler@koreintillery.com

**KOREIN TILLERY, LLC**  
505 North 7th Street, Suite 3600  
St. Louis, MO 63101  
Telephone: (314) 241-4844  
Facsimile: (314) 241-3525

BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)  
bsimon@pswlaw.com

BENJAMIN E. SHIFTAN (Bar No. 265767)  
bshiftan@pswlaw.com

ALEXANDER L. SIMON (Bar No. 305734)  
asimon@pswlaw.com

**PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**  
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-9000  
Facsimile: (415) 433-9008

DANIEL L. WARSHAW (Bar No. 185365)  
dwarshaw@pswlaw.com

BOBBY POUYA (Bar No. 245527)  
bpouya@pswlaw.com

MICHAEL H. PEARSON (Bar No. 277857)  
mpearson@pswlaw.com

**PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**  
15165 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 400  
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403  
Telephone: (818) 788-8300  
Facsimile: (818) 788-8104

*Plaintiffs' Interim Co Lead Counsel*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

AARON SENNE, et al., Individually and on  
Behalf of All Those Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF  
BASEBALL, an unincorporated association  
doing business as MAJOR LEAGUE  
BASEBALL; et al.;

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:14-cv-00608-JCS

**DECLARATION OF STANLEY  
PRESSER, Ph.D., IN SUPPORT OF  
PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO  
MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE  
TESTIMONY OF J. MICHAEL DENNIS,  
Ph.D.**

Stanley Presser declares:

1. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, except where otherwise specified. If called to testify to these facts as a witness in this action, I would so testify.

2. I have been retained by plaintiffs' counsel to evaluate the September 14, 2016 Declaration of Eugene P. Ericksen in Support of Defendants' Motion to Exclude the Declaration and Testimony of J. Michael Dennis, Ph.D.

### **I. Qualifications.**

3. My evaluation is informed by 40 years of experience as a survey methodologist. I received my Ph.D. in 1977 from the University of Michigan, where I was trained at the Michigan Survey Research Center. I am presently a Distinguished University Professor at the University of Maryland, where I teach in the Sociology Department and the Joint Program in Survey Methodology. From 1989 to 2000, I was director of the Maryland Survey Research Center. In 1992, with colleagues at the University of Michigan and Westat Inc., I founded the Joint Program in Survey Methodology, the first graduate-level training program in the United States to offer both master's and doctoral degrees in survey methodology. During 1993-94, I was president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the main professional association for survey researchers, and from 1993 to 1997 I was editor of *Public Opinion Quarterly*, the leading scholarly journal in the field. In 1994, I was elected a fellow of the American Statistical Association in recognition of my contributions to survey methodology. In 2011, I received the AAPOR Award for exceptionally distinguished achievement, and, in 2012, I received the Paul F. Lazarsfeld Award for a career of outstanding contributions to methodology from the American Sociological Association's Methodology Section. My books and articles (listed in Appendix 1) are among the most cited in survey methodology and my research is generally regarded as central to understanding surveys.

### **II. Introduction.**

4. Dr. Ericksen claims that the Dennis survey should not be relied upon because (a) "Dr. Dennis has ... not solved the problem of recall bias"; (b) "Dr. Dennis has not demonstrated that the main survey data are free from non-response bias"; and (c) "Dr. Dennis has also not solved the problem of self-interest bias" (p. 5). These claims, which are speculative and based on faulty

assumptions, are apt to mislead readers who are not survey researchers. The claims about recall bias and “self-interest bias” simply assume (without evidence) that the Dennis survey suffers from such biases. Indeed, the existence of “self-interest bias” has – to my knowledge – never been scientifically demonstrated in any survey. By contrast, the claim about nonresponse bias could be made about virtually every survey, including those that have no nonresponse bias. And Dr. Ericksen provides no evidence there is such bias (or any other kind of bias) in the Dennis survey. Moreover, the Dennis survey followed generally accepted recommendations in survey research about these problems, recommendations based on the results of scientific studies of recall error and nonresponse bias. Finally, Dr. Ericksen claims that Dr. Dennis departed from one of the guidelines listed in the chapter on survey research in the Federal Judicial Center’s *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence*, but this claim is based on a misunderstanding of the *Manual*.

### III. Recall Bias.

5. Dr. Ericksen acknowledges, in a quote from the book *Asking Questions* by Sudman and Bradburn (p. 10 of his report) that memory about salient events is generally good over relatively long periods of time. As Sudman and Bradburn note, the more salient events are, the more likely they will be remembered. Thus Dr. Ericksen’s assertion that the Dennis survey suffers from recall bias depends entirely on his claim that work arrival and departure times were not salient to respondents. According to Dr. Ericksen, “While the experience of playing minor league baseball is likely to have been salient to many respondents, the experiences of arrival and departure times for various training events and games are not salient events” (p. 10). Dr. Ericksen goes even further by claiming “it is unlikely that a respondent who played in 15 spring training games would ever had encoded his arrival and departure times on those days” (p. 12). Both these claims – that arrival and departure times were not encoded and that they were not salient – are purely speculative. Dr. Ericksen presents neither evidence nor argument to support the claims. Furthermore, both claims are wrong.

6. In the Sudman and Bradburn book from which Dr. Ericksen quotes, the authors define salience as “The importance of the topic or question to the respondent as indicated by the thought that has been given to it by the respondent prior to the interview” (p. 301). To say, as Dr. Ericksen does, that “playing minor league baseball is likely to have been salient to many respondents”

1 is a considerable understatement. Playing minor league baseball was unquestionably salient to all the  
 2 respondents – indeed it was central to their lives. Almost every day during spring training (as well as  
 3 during the other playing seasons) the respondents must have thought about arrival time at the ballpark  
 4 to ensure they were on time, something that the testimony from depositions makes clear was  
 5 important to them.<sup>1</sup> And if they were late in arriving there were consequences that would have led to  
 6 further thought about the matter.<sup>2</sup> Similar considerations apply to the time they left the ballpark.  
 7 Consequently, there can be little doubt that Dr. Ericksen is wrong in claiming that minor league  
 8 baseball players' arrival and departure times were not even encoded (which means respondents never  
 9 processed or attended to the information) and that arrival and departure times were not salient (which  
 10 means the information was not important to them). To the contrary, both logic and evidence show  
 11 these times were both encoded and salient.

12 7. Although salient events are generally recalled accurately, survey researchers  
 13 recommend using aided recall strategies in asking about events in the past because that approach has  
 14 been shown to maximize accuracy.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Erickson correctly notes that such “aided prompts or cues  
 15

---

16 <sup>1</sup> For example, “you should be on time” (Rantz deposition p. 20); “Get there on time” (Viola  
 17 deposition p. 40); “Q...it's vital that Marlins players and staff are on time for early work. Would you  
 18 agree with that? A. Agree that it's important they're on time? Q. Yes. A. Yes” (Chattin deposition, p.  
 19 194); “A. Yes, we had a specific designated stretch time that we had to be there by. You also had to be  
 20 there an hour prior to that, was the true requirement. Q. Did somebody tell you that you had to show  
 21 up an hour before stretch time? A. Yes. Q. Who told you that? A. It was either the pitching coach  
 or head coach” (Daly deposition, p. 101); “A: our Manager would write on the board, be here by, you  
 know, a certain time. But everyone knows that if you show up at that time, you're not early, that's not  
 – it doesn't look good, and they're going to question you, ‘Why aren't you here early? Do you not  
 want to get better?’” (Gaston deposition, p. 186).

22 <sup>2</sup> *Id.*

23 <sup>3</sup> Studies that demonstrate the effect of aided recall include “An Alternative Approach to Obtaining  
 24 Personal History Data” by B. Means, G. Swan, J. Jobe, & J. Esposito, Chapter 10 in *Measurement Errors*  
 in *Surveys* edited by P. Biemer, R. Groves, L. Lyberg, N. Mathiowetz and S. Sudman, Wiley: 1991;  
 25 Event History Calendars and Question List Surveys: A Direct Comparison of Interviewing Methods,”  
 by R. Belli, W. Shay, and F. Stafford, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 65 (2001): 45–74; “The Time-Line as a  
 26 Device to Enhance Recall in Standardized Research Interviews: A Split Ballot Study” by W. van der  
 Vaart, *Journal of Official Statistics*, v. 20 (2004): 301–317; and “Methodological Comparisons between  
 27 CATI Event History Calendar and Standardized Conventional Questionnaire Instruments,” by R.  
 Belli, L. Smith, P. Andreski, and S. Agrawal, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 71 (2007): 603–622.  
 28

1 have the potential to lead to an improvement in recall” (p. 12). He then claims that “whether or not  
 2 they [the aided recall strategies] create actual gains needs to be demonstrated empirically, which  
 3 Dennis failed to do” (p. 24). However, Dr. Ericksen fails to mention that – with the exception of  
 4 research studies undertaken solely for methodological purposes – researchers never have the data  
 5 needed to demonstrate that aided recall led to reduced error in their particular survey.<sup>4</sup> The important  
 6 point is that aided recall is recommended practice based on scientific research that has demonstrated  
 7 its efficacy in improving the accuracy of respondents’ reports and therefore Dr. Dennis appropriately  
 8 adopted it.<sup>5</sup>

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
 10 <sup>4</sup> Similarly, Dr. Ericksen cannot demonstrate that aided recall did not reduce recall error.

11 <sup>5</sup> Dr. Ericksen opines that the purported recall error in the Dennis survey is also connected to the  
 12 questionnaire’s being burdensome. He claims that to answer the arrival and departure time questions  
 “the respondent needed to:

- 13 a) Recall all of the home game days during spring training
- 14 b) Count up all of the times that he arrived for a spring training home game and place them  
in each of the 7 categories listed in the question
- 15 c) Recall all of the away game days during spring training
- 16 d) Count up all of the times that he arrived for a spring training away game and place them  
in each of the 7 categories listed in the question
- 17 e) Combine the two numbers, for home and away game days for each of the 7 categories
- 18 f) Make sure that the total numbers for each of the 7 categories add up to the total number of  
spring training game days
- g) Decide which of the 7 categories had the highest frequency of occurrences” (p. 8).

19 Yet Dr. Ericksen offers no reason to believe that performing all these operations is necessary to arrive  
 20 at an approximately correct answer to the following question about arrival time (or to the very similar  
 question about departure time):

21 “Think about game days for your home and away games during Spring Training [in **YEAR/this**  
 22 **year**]. On such game days, please select the time that you would most often **arrive** at your team’s  
 Spring training complex at the start of the work day.

- |                           |                       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 23 ○ 5:00 AM – 5:59 AM    | ○ 6:00 AM – 6:59 AM   |
| ○ 7:00 AM – 7:59 AM       | ○ 8:00 AM – 8:59 AM   |
| 24 ○ 9:00 AM – 9:59 AM    | ○ 10:00 AM – 10:59 AM |
| 25 ○ 11:00 AM – 11:59 AM” |                       |

26 In my judgment, this is not a difficult question and can be answered accurately without unusual effort.  
 27 And it is much less burdensome than questions posed in many high-quality surveys, for example,  
 those about the details of consumer transactions posed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Consumer  
 Expenditure Survey that plays a key role in the measurement of the Consumer Price Index.

1       **IV.     Nonresponse Bias.**

2           8.       As is true of most surveys, many of the individuals who were randomly selected to  
3 participate in the Dennis survey were nonrespondents. Over the past few decades survey  
4 nonresponse rates have grown dramatically.<sup>6</sup> However, the major concern for the quality of survey  
5 estimates is not the nonresponse rate, which is usually known, but the nonresponse bias, which is  
6 almost never known.<sup>7</sup> Most importantly, although a high nonresponse rate increases the potential for  
7 nonresponse bias, in practice high nonresponse rates are not typically related to high nonresponse  
8 bias. This is counter to what survey researchers believed for decades but has now been conclusively  
9 demonstrated.<sup>8</sup>

10          9.       Dr. Ericksen writes that “Dr. Dennis attempted to assess the possibility of non-  
11 response bias by comparing those members of his selected sample who did and did not choose to  
12

---

13 <sup>6</sup> For example, the University of Michigan Survey of Consumer Attitudes experienced a decline in  
14 response rate from 72 percent in 1979 to 60 percent in 1996 (or about three-quarters of a percentage  
15 point per year) followed by a further decline to 48 percent in 2003 (or an additional decline of about  
16 one and a half percentage points per year). See “Changes in Telephone Survey Nonresponse over the  
17 Past Quarter Century,” by R. Curtin, S. Presser, and E. Singer, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69 (2005): 87-  
18 98. Other surveys experienced similar declines ((see, for example, “Gauging the Impact of Growing  
19 Nonresponse on Estimates from a National RDD Telephone Survey,” by S. Keeter, C. Kennedy, M.  
Dimmock, J. Best, and P. Craighill, *Public Opinion Quarterly* v. 70 (2006): 759-779)) so that by 2012 the  
major media surveys were obtaining response rates in only the high single digits (see, for example,  
<http://www.people-press.org/2012/05/15/assessing-the-representativeness-of-public-opinion-surveys/>).

20 <sup>7</sup> This is because, as noted in a recent National Academy of Science’s report, “nonresponse bias is a  
21 function of both the nonresponse rate and the difference between respondents and nonrespondents  
22 on the statistic of interest, so high nonresponse rates could yield low nonresponse errors if the  
23 difference between respondents and nonrespondents is quite small” (p. 41 of *Nonresponse in Social  
Science Surveys* edited by R. Tourangeau and T. Plewes, The National Academies Press: 2013).

24 <sup>8</sup> For examples of studies showing that nonresponse bias is usually unrelated to nonresponse rate, see  
25 “Consequences of Reducing Nonresponse in a National Telephone Survey,” by S. Keeter, C. Miller,  
A. Kohut, R. Groves, and S. Presser, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 64 (2000): 125-148; “Effects of  
26 Response Rate Changes on the Index of Consumer Sentiment,” by R. Curtin, S. Presser, and E.  
Singer, *Public Opinion Quarterly* v. 64 (2000): 413-428; and “The Impact of Nonresponse Rates on  
27 Nonresponse Bias: A Meta-Analysis” by R. Groves and E. Peytcheva *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 72  
(2008): 167-189.



1 participate in his survey” (p. 19).<sup>9</sup> Dr. Dennis’ comparison of respondents with nonrespondents  
 2 followed generally accepted principles of survey methodology, but Dr. Ericksen criticizes Dr. Dennis  
 3 for making the comparison with only three variables: age, fielding position, and most recent year  
 4 played. Dr. Ericksen says that the lack of difference on these variables does not preclude a difference  
 5 on other variables. This argument applies to nonresponse analysis in all surveys. Researchers rarely  
 6 have many variables with which to compare respondents and nonrespondents because very little is  
 7 typically known about the nonrespondents by virtue of their not having responded to the survey. Dr.  
 8 Dennis used the available variables, which is standard practice.

9 10. Dr. Ericksen’s further claim that “Dr. Dennis has not demonstrated that the main  
 10 survey data are free from non-response bias” (p. 5), likewise applies to virtually all surveys, including  
 11 those that produce U.S. official statistics costing tens of millions of dollars. This is because the  
 12 absence of a difference between respondents and nonrespondents on even a large number of  
 13 characteristics cannot prove there is no nonresponse bias as, in principle, a difference might exist on  
 14 some other characteristic that is related to the survey estimate. Nevertheless, although no survey can  
 15 meet Dr. Ericksen’s standard, it bears repeating that Dr. Dennis implemented generally accepted  
 16 recommendations in testing for nonresponse bias and found no evidence of it. Moreover, although  
 17 Dr. Ericksen speculates about the presence of nonresponse bias in the Dennis survey, he provides no  
 18 evidence that such bias actually exists in the survey.

19 11. Finally, even if there were nonresponse bias in the Dennis survey, it could lead to  
 20 either an underestimate of hours worked or an overestimate. Dr. Ericksen claims “It is reasonable to  
 21 believe that those minor leaguers, whether or not they chose to opt into the collective, who felt most  
 22 dissatisfied with their minor league experience were more likely to participate in the survey. To the  
 23 extent that these players did ‘work’ longer hours or were motivated to report longer hours, Dr.

---

24  
 25 <sup>9</sup> This is partly misleading, as what Dr. Dennis actually did was compare those who decided to  
 26 participate with those who were not heard from, which, for some, was because they chose not to  
 27 participate but, for others, was because they never saw the invitation – e.g., the survey invitation was  
 28 sent to an incorrect email address or the address was correct and the invitation was caught by a spam  
 filter or otherwise not read by the recipient. Thus nonresponse to the Dennis survey had two very  
 different components: refusals and noncontacts.

1 Dennis' survey results would be biased upward" (p. 20). Yet this is nothing but Dr. Ericksen's guess.  
 2 It would be equally reasonable to believe that the minor leaguers who were most dissatisfied would –  
 3 because of their dissatisfaction – be most likely to work shorter hours and therefore the survey results  
 4 would be biased downward.

5 **V. Self-Interest Bias.**

6 12. Although he labels it separately, some of Dr. Ericksen's references to "self-interest  
 7 bias" occur in the context of his discussion of nonresponse bias. To the extent it differs from  
 8 nonresponse bias, "self-interest bias" (unlike both nonresponse bias and recall error) has not – to my  
 9 knowledge – been scientifically studied and thus I know of no scientific evidence that it occurs in  
 10 surveys. Indeed I don't ever remember seeing the term used in the survey methods literature.  
 11 Furthermore, Dr. Ericksen has offered no evidence that "self-interest bias" exists in the Dennis  
 12 survey and no evidence that such bias would have a substantial effect on the conclusions drawn from  
 13 the Dennis survey if the bias did exist.

14 **VI. Guidelines of the *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence***

15 13. The chapter on survey research in the Federal Judicial Center's *Reference Manual on*  
 16 *Scientific Evidence* provides guidelines for litigation surveys. These guidelines involve key features of  
 17 surveys such as properly identifying the appropriate population, using a sampling frame that  
 18 approximates the population, employing random selection in drawing a sample from the frame, and  
 19 pretesting the questionnaire. At only one point in his declaration (p. 23) does Dr. Ericksen invoke  
 20 these guidelines. He claims that Dr. Dennis violated the *Manual's* injunction not to identify the survey  
 21 sponsor to interviewers. Before explaining why Dr. Dennis did *not* violate this guideline, it is worth  
 22 observing that Dr. Ericksen's not having invoked any of the *Manual's* other guidelines in his critique  
 23 of Dr. Dennis is consistent with my judgment that the Dennis survey abided by these guidelines.

24 14. Dr. Ericksen's claim that Dr. Dennis violated the guideline to "avoid telling  
 25 interviewers who is sponsoring the survey" misinterprets the *Manual*. It is clear from the context in  
 26 this guideline ("To ensure objectivity in the administration of the survey") that the *Manual* is referring  
 27 to interviewers who collect the survey data—not persons conducting tests to evaluate the  
 28 questionnaire. Dr. Ericksen's claim about a departure from the guideline refers to the fact that Dr.



Dennis, who knew the identity of the survey sponsor, conducted cognitive interviews – interviews done in advance of a survey (not as part of it) to see what, if any, problems respondents might have with the questionnaire. This is a common procedure in pretesting a questionnaire (which is referred to as good practice in the *Manual* on p. 388) and such cognitive interviews, whose properties differ greatly from standardized survey interviews, are never included in the survey data. Moreover, it is common for the person who designed the questionnaire – in this case Dr. Dennis – to conduct the cognitive interviews because that person is uniquely positioned to understand how to carry out these interviews.<sup>10</sup>

## VII. Conclusion.

15. The three claims Dr. Ericksen makes about biases in the Dennis survey should be discounted as (a) I know of no scientific evidence that “self-interest bias” has ever been observed in a survey, (b) Dr. Ericksen presents no evidence that any of the biases are actually present in the Dennis survey, and (c) Dr. Ericksen presents no evidence that any of the biases – if they were present – would substantially change the survey’s results. In addition, Dr. Ericksen’s claim that Dr. Dennis’s survey departed from the guidelines for surveys set out in the Federal Judicial Center’s *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence* is simply a misinterpretation of the *Manual*. In fact, the Dennis survey was conducted in accordance with the recommendations of the *Manual*.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.



Stanley Presser, Ph.D.

Dated: October 14, 2016

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., “The Practice of Cognitive Interviewing,” by P. Beatty and G. Willis, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 71 (2007): pp. 296-298.

**APPENDIX 1**  
STANLEY PRESSER

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

Distinguished University Professor, University of Maryland (2012- ) and Professor, Sociology Department, University of Maryland (1989- ), and Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Maryland--University of Michigan--Westat (1992- ).

Director, Survey Research Center, University of Maryland, 1989-2000.

Director, Joint Program in Survey Methodology, 1992-1995.

Director, Sociology Program, National Science Foundation, 1987-1988 (Associate Director, 1985-1987).

Director, Detroit Area Study, Sociology Department, University of Michigan, 1983-1985.

Head, Field Office, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1981-1983.

OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Editor, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1993-1997 (Chair, Advisory Committee, 1999-2001).

President, American Association for Public Opinion Research, 1993-1994

Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics, American Sociological Association, 1999-2001.

Member, Board of Overseers, General Social Survey, University of Chicago, 1984-1985 and 1993-1997.

Member, Board of Directors, Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, 2006-2008.

Member, Board of Directors, Consortium of Social Science Associations, 2007-2008.

Member, Social, Behavioral, & Economic Sciences Advisory Committee, NSF, 2009- 14.

Member, Fulbright Scholar Sociology Panel, Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 2010-2011

Member, Board of Scientific Counselors, National Center for Health Statistics, 2011-2014.

Member, Survey Questionnaire Standing Committee, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2014-

Member, Electorate Nominating Committee, Section on Social, Economic, and Political Sciences, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2015-

Member, National Academy of Sciences' Panels: Review of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics' Survey Programs, 2002-03 (see *Measuring Personal Travel and Goods Movement*, NRC: 2003); Review of USDA's Agricultural Resource Management Survey, 2006-07 (see *Understanding American Agriculture*, NRC: 2008); Measuring Civic Engagement and Social Cohesion to Inform Policy, 2012-14 (see *Civic Engagement and Social Cohesion*, NRC: 2014); Human Spaceflight, 2012-14 see *Pathways to Exploration: Rationales and Approaches for a U.S. Program of Human Space Exploration*, NRC: 2014).

Editorial Board Member: *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 1979-1982; *Sociological Methods & Research*, 1980-1983; *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1983-1987 (Poll Reviews co-editor, 1987-1992); *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*, 2012-

HONORS

Paul F. Lazarsfeld Award for a career of outstanding contributions to methodology in sociology American Sociological Association's Methodology Section, 2012.

AAPOR Award for exceptionally distinguished achievement, American Association for Public Opinion Research, 2011.

Philip E. Converse Award for outstanding book published at least 5 years before, American Political Science Association's Elections, Public Opinion and Voting Section, 2005 (with H. Schuman).

Member, Sociological Research Association, 2005- .

Fellow, American Statistical Association, 1994- .

Visiting Scholar, Medical School of the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, 2014-15.

Fulbright Scholar, Fudan University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China, 2008-2009.

Senior Visiting Fellow, Social and Community Planning Research (now National Centre for Social Research), London, England, 1995.

Guest Professor, Zentrum fur Umfragen Methoden und Analysen, Mannheim, Germany, 1987.

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Sociology, 1977, University of Michigan.

A.B., Sociology, 1971, Brown University.

BOOKS

*Valuing Oil Spill Prevention*. Kluwer, 2004 (with R. Carson, M. Conaway, M. Hanemann, J. Krosnick, and R. Mitchell).

*Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires*. Wiley, 2004 (edited with J. Rothgeb, M. Couper, J. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin, and E. Singer).

*Survey Research Methods*. University of Chicago Press, 1989 (edited with E. Singer).

*Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Sage Publications, 1986 (with J. M. Converse). Japanese translation, Tokyo: Hirokawa Publishers, 1992.

*Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording, and Context*. Academic Press, 1981 (with H. Schuman). Paperback edition (with revised preface), Sage, 1996.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

"Assessing the Mechanisms of Misreporting to Filter Questions in Surveys," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v.78 (2014): 721-733 (with S. Eckman, F. Kreuter, A. Kirchner, A. Jäckle, and R. Tourangeau).

"The Impact of Partisan Sponsorship on Political Surveys," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 78 (2014): 510-522 (with R. Tourangeau and H. Sun).

- 1 “Support for the Survey Sponsor and Nonresponse Bias,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v.76 (2012):  
2 512-524 (with R. Groves, R. Tourangeau, B. West, M. Couper, E. Singer, and C. Toppe).
- 3 “Substance and Method in Public Opinion Quarterly, 1937-2010” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 75  
4 (2011): 839-845.
- 5 “The Growth of Survey Research in the United States: Government-Sponsored Surveys, 1984-2004,”  
6 *Social Science Research*, v. 40 (2011): 1019-1024 (with S. McCulloch).
- 7 “The Effects of Asking Filter Questions in Interleaved versus Grouped Format,” *Sociological Methods*  
8 *& Research*, v. 40 (2011): 88-104 (with F. Kreuter, S. McCulloch, and R. Tourangeau).
- 9 “Question and Questionnaire Design,” in P. V. Marsden and J. D. Wright (eds.) *Handbook of Survey*  
10 *Research, 2nd Edition*, Emerald (2010): 263-314 (with J. Krosnick).
- 11 “How Social Processes Distort Measurement: The Impact of Survey Nonresponse on Estimates of  
12 Volunteer Work in the United States,” *American Journal of Sociology*, v. 114 (2009): 1129-1165 (with  
13 K. Abraham and S. Helms).
- 14 “Social Desirability Bias in CATI, IVR, and Web Surveys: The Effects of Mode and Question  
15 Sensitivity,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 72 (2008): 847-865 (with F. Kreuter and R. Tourangeau).
- 16 “Is Religious Service Attendance Declining?” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, v. 46 (2007):  
17 417-423 (with M. Chaves).
- 18 “Privacy, Confidentiality, and Respondent Burden as Factors in Telephone Survey Nonresponse,” in  
19 J. Lepkowski et al. (eds.) *Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology*, New York: Wiley, 2007: 449-  
20 470 (with E. Singer).
- 21 “Incentives in Random Digit Dial Telephone Surveys,” *Journal of Official Statistics*, v. 23 (2007):  
22 91-105 (with R. Curtin and E. Singer).
- 23 “Cell Phone Survey Feasibility in the U.S.” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 71 (2007): 23-39 (with M.  
24 Brick, P. Brick, S. Dipko, C. Tucker, and Y. Yuan).
- 25 “Nonresponse Bias in a Dual-Frame Sample of Cell and Landline Numbers,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*  
26 v. 70 (2006): 780-793 (with M. Brick, S. Dipko, C. Tucker, and Y. Yuan).
- 27 “Experiments in Producing Nonresponse Bias,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 70 (2006): 720-736  
28 (with R. Groves, M. Couper, E. Singer, R. Tourangeau, G. Acosta, and L. Nelson).
- “Changes in Telephone Survey Nonresponse over the Past Quarter Century,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*  
v. 69 (2005): 87-98 (with R. Curtin and E. Singer).
- “The Role of Topic Interest in Survey Participation Decisions,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 68  
(2004): 2-31 (with R. Groves and S. Dipko).
- “Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questions,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 68 (2004):  
109-130 (with M. Couper, J. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin, J. Rothgeb, and E. Singer).
- “The ‘Feminist’ Mystique: Feminist Identity in Three Generations of Women,” *Gender & Society*,  
v. 18 (2004): 122-144 (with P. Peltola and M. Milkie).
- “The Science of Asking Questions,” *Annual Review of Sociology*, v. 29 (2003): 65-88 (with N. C. Schaeffer).

1 "Contingent Valuation and Lost Passive Use: Damages from the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill," *Environ-*  
 2 *mental and Resource Economics* v. 25 (2003): 257-286 (with R. Carson, R. Mitchell, M. Hanemann,  
 R. Kopp, and P. Ruud). Reprinted in *Economics of the Environment* R. Stavins (ed.) Norton: 2005.

3 "Context Effects in Attitude Surveys: Effects on Remote Items and Impact on Predictive Validity,"  
 4 *Sociological Methods & Research*, v. 31 (2003): 486-513 (with R. Tourangeau and E. Singer).

5 "The Impact of 'No Opinion' Response Options on Data Quality: Non-Attitude Reduction or  
 Invitation to Satisfice?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 66 (2002): 371-403 (with J. Krosnick, et al.).

6 "Effects of Response Rate Changes on the Index of Consumer Sentiment," *Public Opinion Quarterly*  
 7 v. 64 (2000): 413-428 (with R. Curtin and E. Singer).

8 "Consequences of Reducing Nonresponse in a National Telephone Survey," *Public Opinion*  
*Quarterly*, v. 64 (2000): 125-148 (with S. Keeter, C. Miller, A. Kohut, and R. Groves).

9 "Knowing versus Feeling as Factors in Willingness to Report Information to the Census," *Social*  
 10 *Science Research*, v. 29 (2000): 140-147 (with E. Singer and J. Hoewyk).

11 "Measuring Civilian Defensive Firearm Use: A Methodological Experiment," *Journal of Quantitative*  
*Criminology*, v. 16 (2000): 1-19 (with D. McDowall and C. Loftin).

12 "Data Collection Mode and Social Desirability Bias in Self-Reported Religious Attendance,"  
 13 *American Sociological Review*, v. 63 (1998): 137-145 (with L. Stinson).

14 "Referendum Design and Contingent Valuation," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, v. 80 (1998):  
 484-487 (with R. Carson, M. Hanemann, R. Kopp, J. Krosnick, R. Mitchell, P. Ruud, and K. Smith).

15 "Temporal Reliability of Estimates from Contingent Valuation," *Land Economics*, v. 73 (1997): 151-  
 16 163 (with R. Carson, M. Hanemann, R. Kopp, J. Krosnick, R. Mitchell, P. Ruud, and K. Smith).

17 "Sex, Samples, and Response Errors," *Contemporary Sociology*, v. 24 (1995): 296-298.

18 "Survey Pretesting: Do Different Methods Produce Different Results?" *Sociological Methodology*  
 19 *1994*: 73-104 (with J. Blair).

20 "Informed Consent and Confidentiality in Survey Research" *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 58  
 (1994): 446-459.

21 "Survey Sponsorship, Response Rates, and Response Effects," *Social Science Quarterly*, v. 73  
 22 (1992): 699-702 (with J. Blair and T. Triplett).

23 "Attributes of Questions and Interviewers as Correlates of Interviewing Performance," *Public*  
*Opinion Quarterly*, v. 56 (1992): 236-240 (with S. Zhao).

24 "Little White Lies and Social Science Models: Correlated Response Errors in a Panel Study of  
 25 Voting," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 56 (1992): 77-86 (with M. Traugott).

26 "Can Changes in Context Reduce Vote Overreporting in Surveys?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*,  
 v.54 (1990): 586- 593.

27 "Measurement Issues in the Study of Social Change," *Social Forces*, v. 68 (1990): 856-868.

28



- 1 "Pretesting: A Neglected Aspect of Survey Research," in F. Fowler (ed.), *Health Survey Methods*,  
National Center for Health Services Research, 1989: 35-37.
- 2
- 3 "Collection and Design Issues: Discussion," in D. Kasprzyk, G. Duncan, G. Kalton, and M. Singh  
(eds.) *Panel Surveys*, New York: Wiley, 1989: 75-79.
- 4 "Measuring Public Support for the New Christian Right," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 52 (1988):  
325-337 (with L. Sigelman).
- 5
- 6 "The Use of Survey Data in Basic Research in the Social Sciences," in C. Turner and E. Martin  
(eds.), *Surveying Subjective Phenomena Vol. 2*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1984: 93-114
- 7 "Is Inaccuracy on Factual Survey Items Item-Specific or Respondent-Specific?" *Public Opinion*  
*Quarterly*, v. 48 (1984): 344-355.
- 8
- 9 "Improving the Training of Survey Interviewers," in C. Cannell and R. Groves (eds.), *Health*  
*Survey Research Methods*, National Center for Health Services Research, 1984: 301-304.
- 10 "Discussion of Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing," *Proceedings of the American*  
*Statistical Association Survey Research Methods Section*, 1983: 142-143.
- 11
- 12 "Survey Research Methodology versus Survey Research Practice," *Contemporary Sociology*, v. 12  
(1983): 636-638.
- 13 "Reviewer Reliability: Confusing Random Error with Systematic Error or Bias," *Behavioral and*  
*Brain Sciences*, v. 5 (1982): 234-235.
- 14
- 15 "Studying Social Change with Survey Data," *Social Indicators Research*, v. 10 (1982): 407-422.
- 16 "Context Effects on Survey Responses to Questions about Abortion," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v.  
45 (1981): 216-223 (with H. Schuman and J. Ludwig).
- 17 "The Attitude-Action Connection and the Issue of Gun Control," *The Annals of the American*  
*Academy of Political and Social Science*, v. 455 (1981): 40-47 (with H. Schuman).
- 18
- 19 "Comment on Nelson and on Baloyra," *American Political Science Review*, v. 74 (1980): 459-460.
- 20 "The Measurement of a Middle Position in Attitude Surveys," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 44  
(1980): 70-85 (with H. Schuman).
- 21 "Public Opinion and Public Ignorance," *American Journal of Sociology* v.85 (1980):1214-1225  
(with H. Schuman).
- 22
- 23 "Collaboration and the Quality of Research," *Social Studies of Science*, v. 10 (1980): 95-101.
- 24 "The Open and Closed Question," *American Sociological Review*, v. 44 (1979): 692-712 (with H.  
Schuman). Russian version in the USSR journal *Sociological Research*, July-Sept. 1982: 145-156.
- 25
- 26 "The Assessment of 'No Opinion' in Attitude Surveys," *Sociological Methodology* 1979: 241-275  
(with H. Schuman).
- 27 "Attitude Measurement and the Gun Control Paradox," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 41 (1977-78):  
427-438 (with H. Schuman).
- 28



1 "Question Wording as an Independent Variable in Survey Analysis," *Sociological Methods &*  
2 *Research*, v. 6 (1977): 151-170 (with H. Schuman).

3 "On Stimson's Interpretation of Declines in Presidential Popularity," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v.  
4 40 (1976-77): 538-543 (with J. Converse).

5 TESTIMONY DURING THE LAST 4 YEARS

6 Deborah Heart and Lung Center vs. Virtua Health Inc., et al., New Jersey Superior Court, deposition,  
7 2015.

8 Vaccarino et al., vs. Midland National Life Insurance Co. et al., U.S. District Court, Central District of  
9 California, deposition, 2013.

10 HOURLY BILLING RATE

11 \$1,150  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28